DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 112 RC 023 986

AUTHOR	Mitten, Denise
TITLE	An Analysis of Outdoor Leaders' Ethics: Guiding Decisions.
PUB DATE	2002-01-00
NOTE	21p.; In: Research in Outdoor Education, Volume 6. A Peer-Reviewed Publication of Scholarship First Presented at the Biennial Research Symposium of the Coalition for Education in the Outdoors (6th, Bradford Woods, IN, January 11-13, 2002); see RC 023 980.
AVAILABLE FROM	Coalition for Education in the Outdoors, SUNY at Cortland, P.O. Box 2000, Park Center, Cortland, NY 13045 ($18). Tel: 607-753-4971; e-mail: info@outdooredcoalition.org.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	*Critical Thinking; *Decision Making; *Ethics; Leadership Training; Moral Values; *Outdoor Leadership
IDENTIFIERS	Caring; *Moral Reasoning; Social Justice

ABSTRACT

Outdoor leaders model their values, and their ethical frameworks and moral development help shape their influence on others. Outdoor leaders face many obstacles as they seek to define ethical standards, including the challenge of defining common ethics, lack of professional certifications, the limits of professional ethics, and issues of power and control. A study examined outdoor leaders' ethical frameworks and moral reasoning, as they related to caring and justice orientations and to the use of post-conventional moral arguments. Sixty outdoor leaders drawn from two national organizations completed two instruments: the Defining Issues Test and the Manning Instrument, which measures the use of justice or caring justifications in the face of a moral dilemma. Respondents had a mean age of 36 years and an average of 12 years experience as outdoor leaders; almost all had at least a college degree, and more than half had advanced degrees. The results show that when analyzing dilemmas, these outdoor leaders used critical thinking skills and post-conventional moral arguments, which view moral actions as contextual and societal norms as guidelines rather than laws. In their initial decisions about dilemmas, outdoor leaders made care-centered decisions more frequently than subjects in prior studies and were even more likely to choose care-centered decisions upon reflection. Findings are presented in terms of gender, parental status, social class at birth and now, and age. Implications for the training of outdoor leaders and for further research are discussed. (Contains 34 references) (SV)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 480 112

An Analysis of Outdoor Leaders' Ethics

Guiding Decisions

Denise Mitten
University of Minnesota

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles Yapple

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

RO23986

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AN ANALYSIS OF OUTDOOR LEADERS' ETHICS GUIDING DECISIONS

Denise Mitten
University of Minnesota

INTRODUCTION

Social environments, including family, school, and workplace experiences, shape ethical values and moral practices. Individuals influence our institutions' ethics and institutions influence individuals' ethics. As institutions and professions mature, they often become more powerful than individuals in ethical influence (Welch, 1994). As a result, as professions mature, professionals seek to insure ethical standards in their fields, usually by developing professional ethical standards (May, 1980). Hunt (1995) made a case that outdoor leaders are engaged in a professional practice and that ethics should have a central role in the practice.

Outdoor leaders work in a field that is comprehensive with the outdoor component as the common thread. The purpose of an outdoor trip may be 1) educational, 2) recreational with minimal to great risk, 3) to provide opportunities for personal growth, or 4) therapeutic. A trip may be part of an outdoor adventure pursuits program or may combine several purposes. The trip may be several hours long in a city park or several weeks long in a wilderness setting. A wide variety of people are clients.

Up to 70,000 people a year may participate in wilderness experience programs in the United States (Friese, Hendee, & Kinziger, 1998). Many more people participate in nonwilderness outdoor programs. Over 700 programs offer wilderness opportunities for personal growth in the United States with a predicted increase of 15 percent a year (Ewert & McAvoy, 1999). During these trips, the behavior modeled and the information shared by the outdoor leaders influences a large number of people, including people with many diverse needs. Garvey (1999) stated that outdoor leaders model what they hold to be the most appropriate behavior in a situation: their action models their values. The respect that leaders model for the environment or students teaches about morality. The ethical frameworks and moral development of these leaders helps shape their influence on others. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to provide information about the ethical frameworks used in decision making by leaders of outdoor education programs.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ETHICS RESEARCH TO OUTDOOR LEADERS

In outdoor education, professionals have begun this important process of examining and helping to shape the ethics and define ethical practices applied in this profession (Fox & Lautt, 1996; Fox & McAvoy, 1995a, 1995b; Guthrie, 2001; Hunt & Wurdinger, 1999; Mitten, 1994). As an example, the Therapeutic Professional Group of the Association of Experiential Education has written a set of ethical standards for practice, for use by outdoor leaders in that area (Gass, 1993).

At the same time, Ewert and McAvoy (1999) report that more attention needs to be paid to the quality of leadership of wilderness group programs, and that while outdoor leaders need to continue to focus on technical competency, this cannot be at the expense and exclusion of critiquing leaders' behaviors (Fox & McAvoy, 1995a). Fox and Reed (1994) found that advanced university students in a leadership course in recreation expressed through their writings that they did not understand ethical leadership and saw the role of leadership as primarily task-oriented.

For practitioners to have a professional identity that goes beyond technical expertise, they need to have an identity that includes the moral elements, which distinguish a profession from

ED 439986

an occupation or trade (Bebeau, 1999). This research will help in the understanding of which moral elements may currently be part of outdoor leaders' identity.

Concurrently, there are many obstacles for outdoor leaders as they seek to define ethical standards. In addition to the diversity of the clients and trip duration and location there is the challenge of defining common ethics, the lack of professional certifications, limits to professional ethics, and issues of power and control. This research may help overcome these challenges.

Defining Common Ethics

Both outdoor leaders and their participants are a part of a culture in ethical flux and, according to many, decline (Boss, 1995; Juergensmeyer, 1998; Schaefer, 1998). When moral values are unclear, in flux, or beset by competing interpretations of what is right or wrong, people often become confused about what to do, about what is morally right and wrong; the lure of unethical conduct becomes more powerful and some people become opportunistic (Briles, 1987). Hunt (1995) pointed out that "experiential educators are notoriously individualistic" (p. 338). He implied that some leaders might work in the field primarily to fund personal expeditions giving these individuals less intrinsic motivation to aspire to be ethical professionals. Hunt and Wurdinger (1999) also said that some leaders do not think ethics are relevant. They cited an example of a person who asked a question about a directive that called for deception of students. The staff leader responded "that it was a policy issue and that he didn't have time during staff training to deal with ethics" (Hunt & Wurdinger, 1999 p. 126). The staff leader's behavior and attitude seemed to confuse the staff and implied a lack of ethical accountability. The morals and values will be part of the program, even if unconscious, assumed, and inconsistent (Garvey, 1999). Key concepts in Hunt's (1995) professionalism include a basic duty to put the client's rights and well-being before self-interest, a duty to self-regulation, and service to society.

Lack of Professional Certifications

No widely recognized certifications or other professional controls for outdoor leaders exist (Attarian, 2001; Guthrie, 2001), suggesting a need for a certain amount of congruency in professional ethics. Medina (2001) found that personal experience was the most common type of training background reported by the outdoor leaders in her sample.

A challenge faced by outdoor leaders is defining common ethics. Many companies offer outdoor trips, and many different philosophies exist among these companies. Outdoor leaders have a problem when they seek out a single moral standard to follow, because one does not exist. Ethical dilemmas are exacerbated when individuals may have one code, the companies they work for another code, and the participants or clients of the company another. Guthrie (2001) notes that many outdoor leaders during the busy season receive on the job training, at best.

The Limits of Professional Ethics

As outdoor leaders discuss a professional ethic they need to be aware that a professional ethic, by definition, is a limited or compartmentalized ethic. Ethics have been developed and used because most individuals do not have the understanding to use higher moral thinking without the pressure of these sanctioned professional norms. Professional ethics, however, do not necessarily help professionals achieve the highest ethical standards.

May (1980) describes the problem another way: "When a practitioner is faced with a quandary that includes sorting out moral questions, the practitioner has both formal codes of the profession and informal patterns of behavior that get transmitted from generation to generation in a clinical or practical setting" (p. 213). May (1980) found that standards of performance, informally transmitted, are the most important source of criteria for decision making. The informal venues tend to emphasize technical competence at the expense of other values. The informal and more powerful communication fails to provide independent principles or ways for

criticizing peer leaders whose behavior may be less than exemplary reducing ethics to ethos and morals to prevailing mores.

In outdoor leadership, a problem of focusing on technical competency at the expense and exclusion of critiquing leaders behavior has been noted. Fox and McAvoy (1995a) have written about the importance of outdoor leaders not only having expert technical competency, but also complementing that technical competency with an understanding of how their ethics shape their decisions and behavior.

Issues of Power and Control

Issues of power and control may be especially important to outdoor leaders. Briles (1987) found that opportunity and power were large determinants in whether or not a person engaged in unethical behavior. The more power and opportunity a person had, the more likely he or she was to engage in unethical behavior. Writers (Hunt, 1995; Ryan, 1999) have detailed that outdoor leaders are in positions of power and influence. Outdoor leaders intrinsically have a great deal of power over participants, often in isolated areas. They also have power and influence over the environment. Outdoor trips often take place in wilderness areas with the clients participating in activities perceived as dangerous. Many clients come to outdoor programs with increased feelings of insecurity because of the newness of both place and activity. This insecurity results in accentuating the power difference already there between leaders and clients (Mitten, 1994; Loeffler, 1996). If leaders are aware and understand their own manifestation of core ethical values such as respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, trustworthiness, and self-control, this power can be used to effectively teach character education (Skawinski, 1995). On the other hand this power can be used, unintentionally, to reinforce values seen by many to be negative in our society.

RESEARCH ABOUT ETHICS IN OUTDOOR LEADERSHIP

While little actual research about outdoor leadership and ethics has been done, a great deal has been written about ethics in outdoor leadership. Research by this author uncovered over 200 papers concerning outdoor leadership and ethics. These papers divide into eight categories: 1) environmental ethics (including humans' interdependence with the environment and spiritual connection to the environment) 2) ethical philosophy, 3) teaching ethics and values, 4) quandary ethics, including the use of risk and challenge by choice, 5) the ethics of group dynamics and working with client growth, 6) ethics included in leaders' skills such as decision making and judgment, 7) gender ethics, and 8) inclusivity ethics. The wealth of writing shows the importance of the topic of ethics to outdoor leaders.

As people learn about and use values and rules, they develop ethical frameworks. Fox and Lautt (1996) define ethical frameworks as "complex sets of value claims, rationales, and rules that guide behavior and include the cognitive process (moral reasoning) that lead to decisions and actions" (p. 19).

Fox and McAvoy (1998) highlight the connection between ethical philosophy and frameworks and outdoor leadership practices and the need for more research and continual dialogue to support ethical analysis. Well grounded ethics can help keep a positive and responsive social order. They want ethics to be on the daily agenda, not reserved only for matters of great monument.

Fox and McAvoy (1995a, 1998) found that outdoor leaders use a "multi-layered framework of values and systems" and that "caring and justice were the two values that surfaced most often, either individually or intertwined with other value concepts" (p. 2). Calling attention to needing further study, they note that some of the ethical systems educators seemed to use are inherently exclusive or contradictory. Gender and preference of ethical framework for outdoor leaders has not been studied, though there continues to be a controversy about a gender bias between an ethic of care (as women's preference) and an ethic of justice (as men's preference) (Carse & Nelson, 1996; Gilligan, 1892; Manning, 1992).

Even though professionals in outdoor education have begun to develop an understanding of the ethics used by outdoor leaders, more research about the ethical frameworks used by outdoor leaders is needed to fill in the gaps in the literature (Ryan, 1999). Fox and Lautt (1996) point out that understanding ethical frameworks that outdoor leaders use can help practitioners in outdoor education move towards a congruency between values and behavior. It may help practitioners and managers understand the informal information sharing, as well.

The purpose of this study was to provide information about the ethical frameworks used in decision making by outdoor leaders. To that end this research was an analysis of the ethical frameworks and moral reasoning structures used by outdoor leaders during outdoor trips, and it specifically examined outdoor leaders' ethical frameworks as they related to caring and justice orientations. The specific study questions addressed in this paper are:

- How often do outdoor leaders select *post-conventional moral arguments* as compared to other groups?
- To what extent do outdoor leaders choose care-centered or justice-centered actions?
- What justifications do outdoor leaders use for their actions?
- Is there a relationship between outdoor leaders' actions and justifications and their gender, parental status, birth identity, class identity now, age, and years as an outdoor leader?

METHODS

The purpose of this study was to add to the body of knowledge about the ethical frameworks of outdoor leaders. This research was exploratory and descriptive; no hypotheses were tested. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. To provide data, two instruments, the Defining Issues Test (DIT-2) (Rest & Narvaez, 1998) and the fable instrument developed by Dr. Rita Manning (1992) were used.

The DIT-2

The DIT-2, a quantitative instrument whose validity has been assessed in terms of seven criteria (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999) is a device for understanding moral schemas. Validity and reliability (Cronbach alpha in the upper .70s to low .80s) are discussed in detail in *Post-conventional Moral Thinking: A NeoKohlbergian Approach* (Rest et al., 1999). Used for over 25 years, this instrument measures people's development of social justice concepts. The instrument consists of ratings and rankings of 12 issues for each of four dilemmas. The DIT-2 analyzes a person's responses as activating three schemas: personal interest, maintaining norms, and a Post-conventional moral perspective. A primary measure of the DIT-2 is the P-score, which is a measure of what percent of the times a person uses post-conventional arguments in decision making.

Usually, as people mature so does their understanding of the impact of their behaviors on others. The need to consider others' interests as well as their own is also comprehended. For example, young people primarily think of behavior in terms of how it impacts their personal interests and the people in their immediate circle of family and friends. In secondary school people usually begin to conceptualize cooperation in terms of a greater society. In addition to considering family, friends, and people with whom one has a face-to-face relationship, individuals consider strangers, competitors, and little known acquaintances. They respect and obey authorities and understand the usefulness of social norms in establishing a societal network of cooperation (Rest et al., 1999). Post-conventional thinking is signaled by a move from an unquestioning support of authorities to holding authorities accountable, and from supporting all established practices to supporting only those practices that model the community's shared moral ideals (Rest et al., 1999). In this paradigm, post-conventional thinking is desirable in decision making.

While these schemas have a relationship to Kohlberg's stages (1986), they differ. Kohlberg's theory was based on principled ethics and left no room, as an example, for an ethic of care.

Gilligan (1982) and others have said that measures of moral development do not consider women's ways of decision making. However, the design of the DIT-2 allows for a variety of ethical bases to be included in the Post-conventional thinking measurement. The DIT-2 allows for a variety of ethical bases because "how" the person thinks, such as their consideration, is measured rather than "what" the person thinks. The DIT-2 was chosen for two related reasons: 1) to compare the level of moral development of outdoor leaders to the moral development of other groups, and 2) to aid in interpreting the results of the Manning instrument, which is explained below.

The Manning Instrument

The Manning instrument, using a dilemma open to either a justice or caring moral voice, also is designed to measure moral behavior. An adapted fable outlines the problem: A group of moles have to decide whether or not to accommodate a porcupine in their borrow for the winter. Participants are queried with a series of six-layered open-ended questions. For each question the respondents chose an outcome of 1) throw out the porcupine or 2) accommodate the porcupine. Each question also asked why respondents chose their outcome. Their responses to "why" were their justifications.

Of the six-layered questions, question #1 elicits an initial pre-reflective response to the fable. Question #2 allows for reflection and question #3 tests the assumption that after reflection people generally favor a more "caring" response, even if it is not their initial response (Manning, 1992). Question #4 explores moral fault and question #5 accounts for those who have assumed that the porcupine could "make it on its own" (Manning, 1992). Question #6 adds the implication that compromise is impossible and tests to see if serious harm to the caregivers might change a people's outcomes and justifications.

The Manning instrument was used in a study by Manning and piloted by this researcher before using it for this study. Strength of the Manning instrument includes being open to a caring voice as well as a justice voice and that respondents have opportunities to include justifications for their actions. This qualitative aspect allows the researcher to listen to individuals' own voices and adds clarity to understanding if an action originates from a care or justice orientation. For example, a person may choose for the moles to accommodate the porcupine, not from a caring orientation, but rather a utilitarian principle: "If I care for you now, you will likely care for me later, if I am in trouble." The Manning instrument, by design, gives direction for more in-depth research rather than the answer to any one question.

Demographics

Participants completed a series of demographic questions about class, age, ethnicity, gender, and parental status to see if these are associated with moral reasoning. Approval to conduct the study was obtained from the committee for Protection of Human Subjects of the Institutional Review Board at the University of Minnesota, and each study participant filled out a consent form

Sample Selection

Participants were purposively chosen with the following selection criteria: Study participants should currently lead outdoor trips and either work or have in the past worked at least two months of the year leading clients on overnight trips.

Participants were contacted through listservs, the directory of the Association of Experiential Education (AEE), and the Outdoor Network. First, organizations and individuals were sent a call for participants. Leads from these sources seem to include people who both fit the criteria and are serious about outdoor leadership/education as a profession. After verifying that a participant met the criteria, the selection was open and by convenience. While care is taken in generalizing the results of this study, it is likely that the test population represents a larger group of outdoor leaders (Medina, 2001).

Over 100 outdoor leaders were given questionnaires. To avoid bias, one half of the partici-

pants were asked to complete the DIT-2 first and the other half were asked to complete the Manning instrument first.

After a potential study participant contacted the researcher, he or she was sent either by mail or e-mail a demographics form and consent form. When these forms were returned and study eligibility was verified, it was determined whether the person should first complete the DIT-2 or the Manning Instrument (basically, every other person received the DIT-2 first).

If the participant was to receive the DIT-2 first, the DIT-2 material (a test booklet and answer sheet) was mailed. Because the DIT-2 is machine scored, the answer sheet could not be folded or wrinkled in any manner. The Center for Ethical Development (University of Minnesota) staff confirmed that researchers should, in cases like this study, send a copy of the answer sheet, have the participant complete it, and then transfer the answers to an official score sheet. To minimize error in transfer, the researcher worked in pairs and data were frequently rechecked. When the DIT-2 was returned, the participant was sent via email the Manning Instrument. If the participant did not have email, a paper copy of the Manning Instrument was mailed to the participant.

If the participant was to receive the Manning Instrument first, the order was reversed for sending materials to the participant. A sheet was kept up to date regarding the status of the questionnaires sent and returned. At regular intervals, participants were reminded to return their questionnaires.

Methods of Data Analysis

The DIT-2 was scored by the Center for the Study of Ethical Development. The analysis included a number of variables per subject, including age, education level, and gender. These research results were compared to previous DIT-2 studies. The researcher did further analysis of the data using SPSS 6.1. Results were reported as statistically significant at alpha .05 or less.

The researcher scored the Manning Instrument. The questions were coded on two levels. The first was on the gross level of "throw the porcupine out" or "accommodate the porcupine." Then the responses for the participant's justification were coded. After reading the responses to "why" asked for each question, the researcher set forth categories for the justifications. These categories were aligned as much as possible with those Manning (1992) used. These categories were: 1) Care, 2) Reciprocity, 3) Honor your commitments, 4) Honor property rights, 5) Virtue of hard work, and 6) Self-interest. Three other people (one man and two women) checked the coding systems for the justifications. There was high agreement. Where there was discrepancy as to which category the justification best represented, the category with the highest number of votes was used.

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequencies and means. Independent t-tests, chi square, and analysis of variance were used to determine significance. Results were reported as statistically significant at alpha .05 or less. For One-Way ANOVA tests the Least-significant Difference post hoc comparison was used as a multiple comparison test that examined the statistical differences among group means at the .05 significance level. These research results were compared to those of Manning, but with caution since the populations differ. The results give information to use to begin theory development and suggest guidelines for future research.

RESULTS

Sixty-two people returned the DIT-2 and 60 of them could be scored. Sixty people returned the Manning Instrument and 68 people completed the demographic form. Table 1 summarizes the demographics for 67 outdoor leaders (one person was dropped from the results because his DIT-2 and Manning Instruments were not completed). Respondents averaged 12 years as practitioners. Their ages ranged from 22 to 60 years with the mean age being 36 years old. There were 21 parents (31%). All but two people identified as Anglo. In this study, identity or class is a type of employment classification. Respondents were asked to self-identify their

TABLE 1
Characteristics of Outdoor Leaders

	Total Participants	Female	Male
Age (years)			
Mean	36 years	36 years	36 years
Range	22-60 years	22-57 years	23-60 years
Years in the field			
Mean	12 years	10 years	14 years
Range	1-38 years	1-30 years	1-38 years
Gender:	67	55%	45%
Birth Class ID: (N=67)			
Blue Collar (N=28)	42%	46%	37%
Service (N=10)	15%	19%	10%
Professional (N=29)	43%	35%	53%
Class ID now: (N=64)			
Blue Collar (N=2)	3%	5%	0%
Service (N=15)	22%	24%	21%
Professional (N=47)	70%	65%	79%
Parent Now (N=63):			
Yes	21 / 31%	10 / 27%	11 / 37%
No	42 / 69%	27 / 73%	19 / 63%
Ethnic/Racial (N=63):			
Other	3%	3%	3%
Anglo	97%	97%	97%

birth class as well as their class now. This category may be related to, but is not meant to be an economic class. This variable was included because a sense of identity impacts moral behavior (Bebeau, Rodriguez, & Maeda, 2002). For the purposes of this discussion," birth class" and "class now" will be referred to as "birth class identity" and "class identity now." Given a choice of self-selecting as a person in a working class, service, or professional job classification, 73% of the respondents chose professional as their identity and 25% chose service as their identity for their current job classification. Outdoor leaders identifying as blue collar at birth are more likely to be parents than those identifying as professional class at birth.

In general this group of outdoor leaders is well educated. About 97% of these respondents at least have a college degree and 53% have MS or Ph.D./Ed.D. degrees. Medina (2001) also found over 90% of her outdoor leader respondents had or were finishing an academic degree.

There were no significant demographic differences between the genders. However, there were two strong trends 1) if someone was a parent, the person was more likely to be a male and 2) if someone considered her or his job identity now to be either service or blue collar the person was more likely to be a female. Women also tended, though not strongly, to have worked fewer years as outdoor leaders.

As one would expect, there are significant differences between age and years as an outdoor leader. Usually, the older one was, the longer this person would have been an outdoor leader. Likewise, parents tended to have been outdoor leaders longer and to be older (20 out of 21 parents were at least 35 years old).

How Often Do Outdoor Leaders Select Post-conventional Moral Arguments as Compared to Other Groups?

The DIT-2 measures moral development by asking respondents to pick relevant arguments to five dilemmas, as well as to pick the four most important arguments. The results show how many of the main arguments these outdoor leaders choose were post-conventional in thinking. Post-conventional thinking can indicate that a person will act in the best interest of society. A post-conventional thinking and acting person will see moral actions as contextual, use societal norms as guidelines rather than laws, and put aside her or his personal interest. Martin Luther King is an example of a post-conventional person. If a person were to use societal norms as absolute rules, the person would be said to be operating out of a "maintaining norms" schema. George Wallace would be an extreme example of a maintaining norms person. A person acting out of a personal interest schema would put her or his needs above the law and other societal norms.

Surveys that did not meet the reliability criteria were purged from the study. Two out of 68 surveys were purged. This is significantly below the average elimination rate of 25% to 39% for all DITs (Shulte, 1997, p. 76). P-scores can range from nine to 95 (not 100 because every dilemma does not have four possible P items). For this group of outdoor leaders, the average P-value or post-conventional score was 54. This indicates that the outdoor leaders in this study selected post-conventional arguments 54% of the time. Table 2 shows how this group of outdoor leaders compares to other groups. The average adult selects post-conventional moral arguments about 40% of the time.

TABLE 2
The mean percent of times groups select justifications using post-conventional moral arguments (Bebeau, 1999, Tindall, 2001)

Group	P-Score
Philosophy and political science doctoral students	65
Liberal Protestant seminarians	60
Outdoor leaders	54
Graduate school students	54
Medical students	51
College students	42
The average adult	40
Expert legal witnesses	34
Senior high students	32
Junior high students	22
Institutionalized delinquents	19

The high standard deviation (14.95) for the P-score for this group of outdoor leaders indicates that there was a great deal of variance among this group. The variance shows that 16% of these outdoor leaders were not using the post-conventional schema as often as the average adult while about 81% were using post-conventional arguments more than the average adult does.

Said another way, on the average, outdoor leaders in this study understand and basically accept society's rules. This acceptance is based on formulating and accepting the general moral principles or thinking that underlie these rules. However, when these underlying principles come into conflict with society's rules, outdoor leaders will not necessarily go by convention, many will think in a post-conventional manner and make decisions based on the moral thinking that underlies the convention.

TABLE 3
Outdoor leaders P-scores for select sub-populations

Subpopulation	P-score
Women	57
Men	50
Parents	58
Nonparents	54
Working class birth identity	56
Service birth identity	60
Professional birth identity	57
Service identity now	56
Professional identity	57

Is there a relationship between demographics and P-Scores?

In this group of outdoor leaders, neither education nor age seems to be strong predictors of P-scores, though typically, education and age account for the bulk of variance in P-scores (Rest et al., 1999). This may be due to the large range of ages in a sample with N=62 and the lack of range in education. Additionally, years as an outdoor leader did not seem to have a strong relationship to P-scores.

As is the tendency for the DIT-2, women in this study had higher P-scores than men did (Table 3). While unusual for most populations, gender accounted for the largest variance in the P-scores. Outdoor leaders who believe that they were born into families who worked in service class employment had the highest P-scores (Table 3).

To What Extent Do Outdoor Leaders Choose Care-centered or Justice-centered Actions?

Results from the Manning Instrument showed that the outdoor leaders in this sample seemed to use care-centered actions more than justice-centered actions.

Each respondent received this written fable: *A group of moles spent the summer digging out a comfortable burrow for the winter. When winter came, a lazy porcupine who hadn't bothered to dig its own burrow begged the moles to be let into their burrow. The moles let the porcupine in, but it soon became apparent that things weren't as comfortable as they had once been. The porcupine's sharp quills were jabbing the moles. Based on your reactions to The Fable, please read and answer the questions in the order they are given. Thank you!*

This fable was followed by six questions. Each question had a box to check indicating whether to throw out the porcupine or to accommodate the porcupine. Each question asked for a justification or reason for the decision. When respondents indicated to accommodate the porcupine, this was said to be a care-centered action; to toss the porcupine indicated a justice response. The six questions were as follows:

1. What should the moles do and why?
2. Now, give an answer to this question from a different perspective.
3. Which answer do you like better? Why?
4. Suppose the porcupine had built a burrow but a flood had destroyed it. What should the moles do? Why?
5. Suppose that we add that the porcupine would die if forced outside the burrow. What should the moles do then and why?
6. Suppose that the porcupine's quills were seriously injuring the moles. What should the moles do then and why?

Question #1 elicits an initial pre-reflective response to the fable. In this initial response 70% of the respondents said to accommodate the porcupine. Question #2 asks participants to reflect on the initial response from a different perspective. Respondents usually answered "toss" if they had answered "accommodate" in question #1, and vice-versa. The purpose of Question #2 was to provide a tool for reflection and the results are not reported. After reflection, in response to Question #3, when the outdoor leaders were asked which response they liked better (their response to question #1 or #2) 77% of these outdoor leaders said to accommodate the porcupine. As Manning (1992) suggests, upon

TABLE 4
Respondents indicating to accommodate the porcupine (given in %)

Question	Undergraduate class of Professional and Business Ethics	Outdoor leaders
1 Initial reaction	50%	70%
3 Action upon reflection	Not available	77%
4 No moral fault	91%	88%
5 Porcupine would die	98%	92%
6 Compromise is impossible	40%	30%

reflection, more people choose a caring response.

Question #4 explores whether knowing the porcupine was not to blame for its homelessness would influence one's outcome choice. For example, one's response to Question #1 and #3 may not indicate a caring moral reasoning, but rather a difference in assumptions about blame. Those respondents that did not blame the porcupine for its situation might have chosen to accommodate it, and those that blamed the porcupine for its situation might have chosen to toss the porcupine. When there is no moral fault on the porcupine's part (it was a natural disaster, not laziness that caused its homelessness), more people chose accommodate (88%).

When told the porcupine would die if forced outside, still more of the outdoor leader respondents chose to accommodate. This question accounts for those who have assumed that the porcupine could "make it on its own." Finally, question #6 tests "faith in compromise" as well as tests to see if serious harm to the caregivers might change people's outcomes. When there is the implication that compromise is impossible, 30% of the outdoor leader respondents chose to accommodate. In this question many women and men showed ethical imagination by refusing to see the situation as either/or and continued to propose compromise even when told it was not possible and even when there was risk of injury.

Table 4 compares Manning's undergraduate class of Professional and Business Ethics (given on the first day of class) with this group of outdoor leaders. For Questions # 4-6 the undergraduate class appears somewhat more care-centered than this group of outdoor leaders.

Gender

For the initial or pre-reflective response there were no gender differences. Seventy percent of the women and 70% of the men said to accommodate the porcupine. In Manning's population there was a gender difference, 43% of men and 58% of women said to accommodate the porcupine. Upon reflection (Question #3), three females and three males in this population of outdoor leaders switched their responses from toss the porcupine to accommodate and one female switched her answer to toss the porcupine. There continued to be no significant gender difference for any question. In fact, with a proposed impossibility of compromise, 30% of both women and men continued to say accommodate the porcupine. These results support that male and female outdoor leaders in this study population have similar outcomes in these particular set of decisions.

Parental status

As an initial reaction (question #1), significantly fewer parents chose to accommodate the porcupine (53% verses 78% of the non-parents). After reflection (question #3), 50% of the parents changed their answer from toss the porcupine to accommodate, bringing the percentage accommodating the porcupine to 74%. None of the non-parents changed their responses. When the porcupine was not to blame for its situation, 79% of parents chose accommodate as compared to 93% of the non-parents. This tendency for parents to be more likely to toss the porcu-

pine than nonparents continued when the porcupine would die if turned away and when compromise was implied impossible (questions #5 and #6).

Birth class

As an initial response, those outdoor leaders who said they were born with a "service class" identity had a significantly higher tendency to accommodate the porcupine. Eighty-nine percent of outdoor leaders with a service class birth identity chose to accommodate the porcupine as compared to 67% for each blue collar and professional birth classes. Manning also found that people who identify as service class at birth were more likely to accommodate the porcupine. In Manning's population, 54% of the blue color, 71% of the service and 40% of the professional birth identities chose to accommodate the porcupine. Manning (1992) hypothesized that Nodding's notion that care was learned might be in operation in this case. People growing up in a family where parents work in a service area may see their parents model this behavior and may learn the value of care.

Upon reflection, the responses for all birth classes were similar, with 78% of the service and professional classes accommodating and 75% of the working class accommodating. When the blame is taken away from the porcupine, 100% of the service class birth identity people said to accommodate the porcupine, compared to 88% and 85% of the blue collar and professional classes respectively chose to accommodate the porcupine.

Finally, with the implied impossibility of compromise Manning's theory that "professional class" people learn the least caring skills, may be exemplified in this data. Forty-four percent of the people who identify as service class at birth chose to accommodate the porcupine while 33% and 22% of the blue collar and professional classes respectively chose to accommodate the porcupine.

Class identity now

Because most of the outdoor leaders in this study saw themselves in a professional class (72%), followed by service class (26%), only these two classes were compared. As in birth class identity, there was a tendency in each of the situations for people with a service class identity to be more likely to accommodate the porcupine.

When told that the porcupine was not to blame for its situation, 95% of the outdoor leaders with professional class identities would accommodate the porcupine. That percentage decreased to 92% when told the porcupine would die if forced outside. It seems that blame may be more important than the possibility of death to outdoor leaders with professional class identities. For both situations involving blame or death, 100% of outdoor leaders with service class identities would accommodate the porcupine.

This tendency for a higher percentage of outdoor leaders with service class identities to accommodate the porcupine as compared to outdoor leaders with professional class identities increases dramatically when compromise is implied as impossible; 61% of the outdoor leaders in this study with service class identities chose to accommodate the porcupine and 33% of those with professional identities choose to accommodate the porcupine.

Age and length of time as an outdoor leader

Age and length of time as an outdoor leader are usually related for this population. Therefore tendencies that were true for age are often true for length of time as an outdoor leader. There is such a variance in age that no reliable data can be presented that might indicate what, if any, relationship there might be between age or length of time as an outdoor leader and an outdoor leader's choice of care-centered or justice-centered actions. The data seem to support that people over 30 years may be more likely to toss the porcupine than their younger counterparts, but more research would be needed before any conclusions could be rendered.

What Justifications Do Outdoor Leaders Use for Their Actions?

After reading the responses to "why," asked for each question on the Manning instrument, categories were established for the justifications that these outdoor leaders gave for their decisions either to toss the porcupine or accommodate the porcupine. These categories were aligned as much as possible with those Manning (1992) used. These categories are: 1) Care, 2) Reciprocity, 3) Honor your commitments, 4) Honor property rights, 5) Virtue of hard work, and 6) Self-interest.

- **Care** includes showing compassion and working cooperatively to meet people's needs. It also includes wanting to help others, wanting to alleviate suffering, and wanting to protect life.
- **Reciprocity** was indicated when one person helped another thinking that at some point in the future he or she may need help from the person that he or she is currently helping.
- **Honor your commitments** is a principle from justice ethics.
- **Honor property rights** is a principle from justice ethics.
- **Virtue**, in this case, asks if laziness should be penalized and hard work rewarded.
- **Self-interest** says that people should help themselves first, or my group is more important than other groups.

Forty-eight respondents gave justifications for Question #1, 40 for Question #3, 55 for Question #4, and 54 for Question #5, and 56 for Question #6. The sample size is small, making it difficult to draw conclusions about subsets of the sample; however, the results are markedly different for some groups. This data point to suggested areas for further research. After reporting the results for the total population, results for some demographic subsets are included.

As an initial reaction to the situation (Question #1), the justification most often given was caring (33%), which was used nearly twice as often as the next justification, virtue 16%). These justifications were followed by the principles of honor your commitments (12%), self-interest (7%), and reciprocity (4%). Here is one example of a caring justification from a participant: "Show compassion for the porcupine because the porcupine might have had something bad happen – perceiving laziness. Find out the reason story first." Other care responses were grounded in compassion slightly differently: "The basic good Samaritan thing to do—a little accommodation and change is always hard but usually is beneficial in the long run."

The responses after reflection (Question #3) increased in care justifications to 39%, the percent of missing responses increased, and each of the other responses decreased (roughly) proportionally. As a justification after reflection, one respondent commented, "I like the accommodation because it seems like a cooperative choice. One should always try to help other." Therefore, one might wonder that, if upon reflection, people become more care-centered in their outcomes, as well as more caring in their heart. This speaks to a concern that leaders might want to carefully monitor their own stress levels so that they have the time and capacity to reflect, rather than become caught up in reaction. A response for a study participant might illustrate this concern:

> I had to think about this one, since the second perspective makes me feel much more open, enlightened, compassionate. But at this moment I am feeling that there is just too much suffering in the world for me to fix it, and I can't rescue this porcupine because there would just be a flood of other porcupines in the same predicament, and pretty soon the moles who were trying to save everyone would be burnt out.

When the porcupine was not to blame and a natural cause made it homeless, as tested in Question #4, more respondents made a justification; only 18 % were missing and the nature of the justifications shifted somewhat. The use of reciprocity as a justification increased to 9%, care increased to 49%, and virtue increased to 16%. The virtue justification may have increased

because people were saying that since the porcupine wasn't lazy, they would help. For example, "If the porcupine had built his/her own burrow but lost it, the porcupine should have explained this to the moles. Perhaps this would help the moles empathize with the porcupine."

When told the porcupine would die (Question #5) a few more people shifted to care and more argued for honoring your commitments. Fewer respondents used a self-interest justification or a justification based on reciprocity.

The responses when the situation was implied impossible showed a very different distribution. Self-interest now almost equaled care in justification. Care justifications went down by 21% and self-interest justifications rose by 19%. A self-interest justification example is, "The porcupine has to leave. They should put him out even if he is a close friend or family. No person should cause problems with one's health." Another response with a self-interest justification is "He would have to go. Don't put yourself in grave danger just to help save someone. But make your best possible effort."

Gender

Initially, men and women showed little difference in their justifications. Both used the care justification most often, though men's second choice was virtue saying that laziness should be punished and hard work rewarded, while women's second choice was a tie between honor your commitments and virtue. As they reflected (Question #3), however, men and women differed in justifications. Both men and women increased their numbers of care justifications, but women had a larger increase than men did (to 70% and 56%, respectively). Twenty-five percent of men continued to have a virtue justification while women's second choice was self-interest (13%). When no compromise was implied (Question #6), care justification decreased to 41% for the men and 44% for the women. Self-interest rose to 29% for the men and 37% for the women.

Parental status

As in the outcome choices of toss or accommodate, larger differences were found among birth identities and between parents and non-parents than between genders. Initially (Question #1), parents (33%) used care as a justification fewer times than non-parents (49%) and used self-interest as a justification much more (parents 27% and non-parents 3%). This may reflect a micromorality view, which changed upon reflection. After reflection (Question #3), parents used care 67% and non-parents 63%. As a group, reflection seemed to help parents change to caring more than any other group. While, for parents, self-interest remains the second highest justification for each of the first five questions, these parents continue—when the porcupine is not to blame or would die if forced out (Questions #4 and #5)—to use care more times in their justifications than non-parents. When compromise is implied impossible and the risk of injury to the moles increases (Question #6), parents' self-interest justifications equal those of care, while non-parents have fewer self-interest justifications and more virtue justifications.

Class identity

Outdoor leaders who described their birth identity as service were far more likely to justify their outcomes with care. As an initial reaction to the porcupine situation, 83% percent of the outdoor leaders who described their birth identity as service, or almost twice as many as this general population of leaders, justified their outcomes with care. This compares to 35% of blue collar birth identity and 42% in professional birth identity. After reflection (Question #3), 100% of birth identity of service justified their actions with care, whereas 53% of professional birth identity and 60% of blue collar birth identity chose care. When a natural disaster destroyed the porcupine's shelter (Question #4), 22% of those who defined their birth identity as service changed their justification to reciprocity.

As the situation became graver and the porcupine would die if turned out, the amount of care that was used as a justification remained the

same for the service birth class. Reciprocity split, and half of that group used the virtue justification. An example is "the moles should accommodate the porcupine only they should set down rules and let the porcupine know that he needs to work..."

When compromise was implied as impossible (Question #6), still 44 % of those outdoor leaders having service birth identities justified their outcome with care and only 11% with self-interest. This compares with 26% of professional identity and 35% blue collar justifying with care and 22% professional and 31% blue collar justifying with self-interest.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study answered a call from Fox and McAvoy (1995b) saying that future research should include information about outdoor leaders preconceptions and abilities in using critical thinking skills and in analyzing dilemmas. The results from the DIT-2 seem to show that the outdoor leaders in this study have the ability to use critical thinking skills and analyze dilemmas using Post-conventional thinking. In this study it was found that this well educated group of outdoor leaders selected Post-conventional moral arguments more often then the average adult, more often than expert witnesses in Tindall's 2001 study, and slightly more often than most graduate school students. This population of outdoor leaders selected post-conventional arguments less than Liberal Protestant Seminarians did. Overall this may imply that outdoor leaders in this study use a high level of moral reasoning during their decision making.

Most of the outdoor leaders in this study had completed graduate school. This may indicate that the training of outdoor leaders at the graduate level is useful in helping develop critical thinking skills.

When faced with an initial decision with moral implications, outdoor leaders in this study used care-centered actions to a significantly higher extent then previously reported by Manning (1992). Upon reflection, an even higher portion of outdoor leaders opted for care-centered actions. These data seem to support that when given an opportunity to reflect, people will more often choose a caring response. Perhaps there is a knee-jerk reaction that people first express. This phenomenon seemed especially true for parents in this study. Upon reflection, 50% of the respondents who were parents changed from justice-centered to care-centered actions. However, these same parents returned to justice-centered actions and self-interest justifications when compromise became challenging and was implied impossible. Those outdoor leaders with a professional class identity at birth also had a large percentage change (11%) from justice-centered actions to care-centered actions when answering question #3 after reflection.

There was no gender difference in initial reaction of these outdoor leaders. It appears that both male and female outdoor leaders may lean towards care-centered actions, which may signal an emphasis on maintaining relationships. This lack of significant difference between genders continued for each question. Women tended to use care more often then men did for a justification for their actions. Men tended to use virtue justifications more than women did. This may indicate that while men and women, in this study, both favor care-centered actions, they may have different motivations behind their behaviors. Gilligan (1982) said that men and women have different ways of reasoning morally. This study seemed to show that outcomes for the genders can be similar even if the justifications behind their reasoning are different. It would make sense that in training programs and in debriefing after trips that leaders would be asked to relate why they made decisions as a way to more clearly understand the moral reasoning of the leaders.

These data support that people are more caring when they believe that the being that needs help is not at fault for the predicament. In general, more caring and more reciprocity justifications were indicated when the situation implied that the porcupine was not to blame for its homelessness. Natural disasters and the September 11 terrorist attacks are examples where outpouring of help may be attributed to caring, wanting reciprocity, and seeing the victims as innocent. This also presents an ethical problem,

namely that the outdoor leaders in this study may judge whether a participant ought to be helped in relationship to the leaders' judgment of the participant's fault in a situation. One respondent commented, "Throw the porcupine out … they are enabling him to be irresponsible by helping him out of a tough situation he created." One the other hand, another leader thought to wonder, "Because he did not prepare for winter the same way that the moles did should not be a category for denying him safety from impending winter. Also we do not have enough information as to why the porcupine did not prepare a home. Is the porcupine lazy in reference to the moles…". The second response indicates a willingness to suspend judgment. Leaders' judging behavior has practical implications both for training and supervision needs.

If the possibility of death is raised, these outdoor leaders prefer care-centered actions. Over 90% would accommodate the porcupine. Still, for this question, this is less than the percent of students in an undergraduate business and professional ethics class who would choose care-centered actions (Manning, 1992). This may imply that a few of these outdoor leaders do not see death as something to prevent if there is risk of injury to self. One respondent said, "Throw him out, you can't risk your own safety to save another." This too, has training and supervision implications. While most outdoor leaders have been taught not to save a drowning person, if it might mean drowning oneself, one would want to be sure that outdoor leaders used as accurate judgment as possible when making these sorts of assessments. This includes being able to accurately assess their participants' abilities and their own abilities. Actually, outdoor leaders who saw themselves with a professional class identity now would be less likely to use care-centered actions if they thought a being was going to die than if they thought the being was not to blame. While this difference was not significant, the results may have training and supervision implications. As mentioned above, the leader's judgment of the participants' culpability in a situation seems to influence the leader's use of care-centered actions. More research is needed to see if this possible tendency to judge behavior had safety implications for adventure trips.

Outdoor leaders in this study with a birth identity of service class or an identity now of service class tended to be more likely to use care-centered actions and care-centered justifications than outdoor leaders in this study from a professional class birth identity or that same identity now. This difference was seen in the responses to every question in the Manning Instrument as well as the DIT-2 results. These results are significant in that they may imply that role identity may have an important relationship to whether or not an outdoor leader chooses a care-center action. For this study, class identity was purposefully designed to be self-identified. A person's identity speaks to one's beliefs about oneself. Research has shown that a person's perception of his or her role identity to be very central to his or her professional ethics (Bebeau et al., 2002). Bebeau et al. (2002) found that when people are referred for courses in dental ethics because of violations of the dental practice act, they have been unable to articulate the key expectations of the role of a dental professional. After completing a course designed to help with understanding the moral role of a dentist, role identity increased, moral development scores increased, and violations decreased. This is akin to outdoor leaders developing a concept of what the role of a professional outdoor leader is. Implied by Ewert and McAvoy (1999) and also pointed out by Bebeau et al. (2002) an objective in an ethics curriculum or training program for leaders is to help socialize students to a professional identity that goes beyond technical expertise and good business acumen toward an identity that has a positive impact on moral behavior. People who have acquired a service identity may have a sense that their role includes helping to create a more caring atmosphere.

Outdoor leaders who identify with a service ethic may be more relationship focused and compassionate than outdoor leaders with working class of professional class identities. Manning (1992) hypothesized that Nodding's notion that care was learned might be in operation in this case. People who grew up in a family where their parents worked in service areas may have

seen their parents model accommodation and compromise behavior and may have learned the value of care. In general, they may also have received and practiced more caring behavior in their homes than people from other class backgrounds. For example, some respondents suggested using the porcupine's underbelly for warmth and had other suggestions for accommodation. In situations where compromise is challenging, problem-solving skills involving compassion are important for outdoor leaders. Outdoor leaders can be in high-risk situations requiring the leader to think well and quickly to solve a problem in a manner that brings everyone home.

Parents were distinct in their initial reaction as being the least likely subgroup to accommodate the porcupine. This subgroup also had the highest percentage of respondents that changed their response after reflection. The results of this study were different from Manning's results regarding parental status. She had thought that parents might be more likely to use care-centered action because they were parents (1992). This study did not show that. Rest et al. (1999) distinguishes between macromorality and micromorality. When people are more focused on micromorality they pay more attention to the welfare of their family and friends than the impact of their actions on the greater society. Parents in this study seemed to focus on mircromorality. One might think that being a parent might inspire caring, or that it might influence people to "take care of their family first." In this population the latter explanation may have been in effect. Another possible reason for these results is that parents are under stress and tend to say "no" or take a more justice-centered stance at first.

The data from these two instruments show a tendency for the outdoor leaders in this study to exhibit care-centered actions that seemed to complement (not interfere with) a post-conventional social justice frame of mind. Fox and McAvoy (1998) found that caring and justice were the two values that surfaced most often, either individually or intertwined with other value concepts. They also found that some ethical frameworks outdoor leaders use might conflict with one another. This study shows that there may be some situations where this group of outdoor leaders may prefer to use an ethic of care (when a life is in danger) and some situations (when they think a being is at fault) where they may use a justice ethic. Care-centered or justice-centered behavior also can be part of another tradition (such as the Aristotelian idea of virtue, the normative and utilitarian approach, the pragmatic criteria, and feminist ethical concepts related to care and marginalization, which are interwoven with spiritual concepts from the Christian and Buddhist traditions and aboriginal and indigenous perspectives).

Like Manning (1992) this study tested a number of variables not with the purpose of settling issues about moral development and decision making, but rather to give training direction and offer future direction for research.

Training Implications

While more research is called for, this contribution already offers implications for training and other practical applications:

- Outdoor leaders may need additional training in understanding the impact of their judgments of blame on their leadership and their use of care-centered or justice-centered actions.
- Outdoor leaders may need additional training in assessing their own and their participants' physical capabilities, especially where wilderness dangers and risk are concerned.
- Outdoor leaders may benefit from interventions designed to increase moral development through the understanding of the role of a professional outdoor leader. This may be especially true for outdoor leaders who have not completed graduate school degrees or outdoor leaders who do not have a service class identity.
- Outdoor leaders may benefit from additional training in service leadership and the service aspect of leading trips. Understanding the role of the profession through training may be important in helping outdoor leaders understand their

role in managing and working with group dynamics and other interpersonal workings on trips.
- Outdoor leaders may benefit from further training in understanding the informal mores that have been handed down through the years.

Limitations of This Research

The results of the study are valid for this study population. Some generalizations may be made with caution; however, more studies to confirm these results would add strength to the research pool. While an N=62 is enough to get an idea of the moral reasoning skills and choice of care- or justice-centered actions, it is not enough to reliably test all the variables. To that end, future studies targeting subpopulations may be helpful.

Participation in this study required filling out two survey instruments. People are very busy and therefore possibly a certain type of person self-selected for this study (one that had the time and inclination to fill out the surveys).

Implications and Recommendations for Further Research

As Rest et al. said, "Successful research is never final or completed. One solid finding leads to further questions, conjecture, and theorizing, which in turn lead to fruitful new theories and new findings" (1999, p. 99). This research has provided some responses to the study questions and illustrates the need for further research in the area of ethical frameworks used by outdoor leaders in decision making.

All the variables examined during this study could benefit from further examination with a larger population of leaders. In this study there were too few people in any age group (even when clumping respondents) to make any remarks about how age relates to care- or justice-centered actions and justifications for this population. To that end surveying a larger group of outdoor leaders or targeting a specific age group for a study would be useful. The same situation is true for the variable "length of time as an outdoor leader." Looking at "length of time as an outdoor leader" might shed some light on the informal chains of ethical information that operate for outdoor leaders.

Additionally, the majority of the outdoor leaders in this study were college graduates and more than 50% had completed graduate degrees. A future study might want to concentrate on outdoor leaders who have not completed graduate school. Formal education has been found to increase one's use of Post-conventional arguments. The sample used in this study may over-represent outdoor leaders who have completed graduate school. Additionally, a more in-depth analysis of parental status and its affect on use of care-centered actions should be completed.

A more in-depth analysis of class identity and its affect on use of care-centered actions should be undertaken. This study showed several tendencies regarding class identity. One tendency shown was that birth class identity and class identity now may impact an outdoor leader's use of care-centered actions, their justifications, and the situations in which they choose to use care-centered actions.
More research about the association of demographics to moral reasoning perhaps could help guide-training programs.

SUMMARY

If an ethic of care could be said to house the voice of compromise and accommodation (with a good dose of ethical imagination), then I would conclude that many of the outdoor leaders in this study use an ethic of care.

These outdoor leaders, when faced with an initial decision, use higher care-centered actions then previously reported by Manning (1992). Upon reflection, even a higher percentage of outdoor leaders use care-centered actions and when the being is not to blame for the situation or if the being might die if not helped, care-centered actions also increase. If a situation becomes more life threatening, as a group, care-centered actions increased, though this tendency did not hold true for outdoor leaders in this study who see themselves as having a profess-

sional class identity now. If compromise is implied impossible, care-centered actions drop significantly for the outdoor leaders in this study.

These data support that for both female and male outdoor leaders, in this population, care seems to be integral in their ethical frameworks. It does support that women's intent or justifications for their actions are different than men's justifications.

The subgroup of outdoor leaders from this study with either a service birth class identity or a service class identity now showed significantly higher use of care-centered actions and had the strongest relationship to care justifications for decision making throughout the study.

REFERENCES

Attarian, A. (2001). Trends in outdoor adventure education. *Journal of Experiential Education, 24*(3), pp. 141-149.

Bebeau, M. J. (1999). Influencing the Moral Dimensions of Dental Practice: Implications for the professions. University of Minnesota: Center for Ethical Development.

Bebeau, M. J., Rodriguez, & Maeda, Y. (2002) Using DIT moral schema profiles to evaluate educational intervention effects. Unpublished manuscript. University of Minnesota: Center for Ethical Development.

Boss, J. A. (1995). Teaching ethics through community service. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 18*(1), 20-24.

Briles, J. (1987). *Woman to woman: From sabotage to support.* Far Hills: New Horizon Press.

Carse, A.L. & Nelson, H. L. (1996). Rehabilitating care, *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal, 6.1*, 19-35.

Ewert, A. and McAvoy, L. (1999). The effects of wilderness settings on organized groups: A state of knowledge paper. *Proceedings: Wilderness Science in a Time of Change.*

Fox, K. M., & Lautt, M. (1996). Ethical frameworks, moral practices and outdoor education. In L. McAvoy, L. A. Stringer, M. D. Bialeschki, & A. Young. *Coalition for education in the outdoors third research symposium proceedings* (pp. 18-33). Cortland: State University of New York College at Cortland.

Fox, K. M., & McAvoy, L. H. (1995a). Ethical leadership in outdoor recreation. *Trends, 32*(3), 21-26.

Fox, K. M., & McAvoy, L. H. (1995b). Ethical practices in the field of outdoor leadership. In L. S. Frank (Ed.) *Association of Experiential Education International Conference Proceedings, 23,* 70-72.

Fox, K. M., & McAvoy, L. H. (1998). Ethical frameworks for outdoor leaders. Unpublished manuscript.

Fox, K. M., & Reed, M. (1994). Learning about ethical leadership. In L. McAvoy, L. A. Stringer & A. Ewert. *The coalition for education in the outdoors second research symposium proceedings* (pp. 53-65). Cortland: State University of New York College at Cortland.

Friese, G., Hendee, J., & Kinziger, M. (1998) The wilderness experience program industry in the United States: Characteristics and dynamics. *The Journal of Experiential Education. 21*(1), 40-45.

Gass, M. (1993). Ethical principles for the therapeutic adventure professional group. In Gass, M. A. (Ed.) *Adventure therapy: Therapeutic applications of adventure programming* (pp. 451-461). Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

Garvey, D. (1999). Outdoor Adventure Programming and Moral Development. In J. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure Programming* (pp. 133 – 139). State College: Venture Publishing.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Guthrie, S. P. (2001). The profession of adventure leadership. *Journal of Experiential Education, 24*(3), 132-135.

Hunt, Jr. J. S. (1995). Ethics and experiential education as professional practice. In K. Warren, M. Sakofs & J. S. Hunt Jr. (Eds.), *The theory of experiential education* (pp. 331-338). Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

Hunt, Jr. J.S. & Wurdinger, S. (1999). Ethics and Adventure Programming. In J. Miles & S. Priest (Eds.), *Adventure Programming* (pp. 123 – 131). State College: Venture Publishing.

Juergensmeyer, M. (1998). Christian violence in America. (Americans and Religions in the Twenty-First Century). *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 558*(13), 88

Kohlberg, L. (1986) *Essays on moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages, Vol. 2.* San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Loeffler, T. A. (1996). Sexual harassment and experiential education programs: A closer look. In K. Warren (Ed.), *Women's voices in experiential education* (pp. 213 – 225). Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.

May, W. (1980). Professional ethics. In D. Callahan & S. Bok (Eds.), *Ethics teaching in higher education.* New York: Plenum Press

Manning, R. C. (1992). *Speaking from the heart: A feminist perspective on ethics*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Medina, J. (2001). Types of positions, job responsibilities, and training backgrounds of outdoor/adventure leaders. *Journal of Experiential Education, 24*(3), 150-159.

Mitten, D. (1994). Ethical considerations in adventure therapy: A feminist critique. In E. Cole, E. Erdman, & E. Rothblum (Eds.), *Women and Therapy* (pp. 55-84). NY: Harrington Park Press.

Rest, J. R & Narvaez, D. (1998). Guide for DIT-2: A guide for using the Defining Issues Test, Version 2 ("DIT-2") and the scoring service of the Center for the study of Ethical Development. University of Minnesota: Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Rest, J, Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M., & Thoma, S. (1999) *Post-conventional moral thinking: A NeoKohlbergian Approach.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers

Ryan, S. (1999). Environmental Ethics: An interpretive analysis of outdoor leaders'/scholars' discourse. Masters' thesis. University of Alberta: Department of Physical Education and Recreation.

Shulte, M. F. (1997). Ethical Decision Making Among Health Care Executives: A Study of the Relationship Between Cognitive Development, Ethical Reasoning Skills and Ethical Behavior of Health Care Executives. Unpublished Doctorial Dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, Ft. Lauderdale, FL.

Skawinski, C. (1995). Moral education and outdoor education—an interview with Tom Lickona. *Taproot. 9*(2), 6-9.

Schaefer, T. (1998). Group hopes to stem nation's 'moral decline'. *The Wichita Eagle* (p 603K5201.) Wichita, KS: Knight-Ridder Newspapers

Tindall, L. J. (2001) A Study of the Moral Reasoning Skills of Expert Witnesses. Doctoral Thesis. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Welch, D. (1994). *Conflicting agendas: Personal morality in institutional settings.* Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE

I. Document Identification:

Title: Research in Outdoor Education, Volume 6

Author: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors (CEO)

Corporate Source: CEO

Publication Date: January 2002

II. Reproduction Release:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please check one of the following three options and sign the release form.

____ Level 1 - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.

____ Level 2A - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

__X__ Level 2B - Permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no option is marked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

Sign Here: "I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Charles H. Yaple Position: Executive Director

Printed Name: Charles H. Yaple Organization: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors

Address: E314 Park Center, SUNY Cortland, Cortland, NY 13045

Telephone No: 607-753-4968

Date: 9/25/03

III. Document Availability Information (from Non-ERIC Source):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price per copy: Quantity price:

IV. Referral of ERIC to Copyright/Reproduction Rights Holder:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please complete the following:

Name:

Address:

V. Attach this form to the document being submitted and send both to:

Velma Mitchell, Acquisitions Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools
P.O. Box 1348
1031 Quarrier Street
Charleston, WV 25325-1348

Phone and electronic mail numbers:

800-624-9120 (Clearinghouse toll-free number)
304-347-0467 (Clearinghouse FAX number)
mitchelv@ael.org